

Ramshaw

Ramshaw

a.

Ranshaw-Ransha- Ramshee- Ramshaw-Ramshawe-Renshaw-Rainshaw etc.

1. Thomas Ramshee-Ramshaw:

1623, Summer: The Sparrow, a little 30 ton trading vessel arrived at Virginia. (2 Rec.Va. Comp. p.496)

Edward Maunders, purser, was accused of appropriating goods belonging to the owner, Thomas Weston. The case came up in Court Jan.9, 1623/4; and again February 20, 1625/6. On the latter date Thomas Ramshee testified that Mr. Westone was owner of the Sparrow "and sett her out at his Charge from London"- that "maunder came as purser of her, and this deponent knoweth of no goods that maunders had" of his own in the ship, he being a very poor man and had to borrow money from Weston for the necessities of the trip over. This testimony plainly shows it is first hand information; and that Thomas Ramshaw (Ramshee being obviously a phonetic or clerical misspelling.) (Minutes of the Council and General Court, pp.10;96)

*was in Va. at least as early as 1623*

Thomas Ramshaw is not in the Muster of 1624/5; but this testimony, given February, 1625/6 by Ramshaw, shows he was in Virginia before that Muster. This Thomas Weston was the one who engineered the so-called "flight" of the Brewster-Bradford Scrooby group to Holland 1608; and later the voyage of the Mayflower to New England- a trader and professional promoter. It is probable, judging from the little record evidence available, that Ramshaw was associated with him to some degree; and that Ramshaw was in Virginia even much earlier than 1623. This is indicated by his earliest land holdings in Virginia.

1635, July 27- Pat. issued to Thomas Ramshaw for 50 a. upon Warwick r. and Deepe Cr.; trans. 1 servant- unnamed. Asterix shows omission is in the record and not merely by compiler because of imperfect ms.

Same date, to same- pat. for 250 a. Eliz. City Co upon land of Chris. Stokes, on new Poquoson. Trans. 3 persons as above. (These two tracts evidently on the divide between the York and James rivers.) (1 Nugent 29)

For reasons too complex to give time to at this writing, patents of this type began to appear 1635. They are renewals, not original patents, in compliance of an order by the King in 1634. So far as I have investigated, they are the earliest patents of early arrivals- for instance, Capt. Thomas Harris, 1611, recd. pat. for 700 a. Henrico, 400 a. willed him by Ann Gurganey Feb. 1619/20; so we know he had that land as early as that date; and the other 300 a. for 8 persons unnamed. This in July 1637 (ib. 60); yet on Nov. 17, 1635, he recd. pat. for 750 a. adj. Edward Yirgany (that is unquestionably Gurgany or Gurganey- in other words, adj. the original Gurganey land willed to Thomas in 1619/20 by Gurganey's widow); This land for 13 persons named. The pat. of 1637, being renewal of Harris' first pat. of which there was no extant record, 1637/1/1/ (1 Nugent 33) (There is quite a story connected with this phase- too long for this analysis.)

Thomas Ransha, recd. pat. Aug. 23, 1642, 300 a. also upon Deepe Cr. near to Stokes Cr. dividing this from Chris. Boyce in Warwick Co. 150 a. by purchase, 159 for 3 prans. named. (Id. 133)

Original in Mallincoote folder

Thomas Ramshaw also had land in the Upper County of New Norfolk, according to patent to Thomas Holt, May 22, 1637- which patent is vaguely described as "N. side of E. branch of Eliz. R. upon the maine R. Sly into the woods, N. upon the head of the river, Ely & downe the river lying upon a Cr. joining upon land of Thomas Ramshaw Wly..." (Id. 57)

There is not one thing to show when or how Thomas came into possession of this land; therefore the inference is he must have acquired it and recorded it in record book then extant but not now, since apparently the survey was in his name, whether he still owned it or not. The question arises therefore, is this not the same land referred to in the patent to Thomas Heeres May 17, 1637. Heere's pat. described: "Up Co. New Norf. 3 ml. up in Eliz. R. adj. land of William Ramshaw to the woods Sly on the maine R. & Ely up the river." (Heeres pat. for 6 persons unnamed.) (Id. 55, 57)

In other words- I take the Ramshaw land in Up. Norf. to have been pat. to Thomas and surveyed in his name, hence his name appearing in Holt's pat.; and Thomas having transferred it to William who was owner in 1637, hence William's name appearing in Heere's pat. The location seems to be identical in both.

The patent to William Rainshaw, Sep. 14, 1636, may be the explanation of when this land was transferred to William, at which time William, having "seated" the land, took out a patent in his own name: 150 a. in Eliz. City Co. being a neck of land "some 3 ml. up Eliz. river bounding Sly into the woods, Nly upon the maine river, Ely & Wly upon a Cr." This land for trans. 3 persons all named, hence an original patent since nothing to indicate it is otherwise, although it may be for land originally patented by Thomas- yet seated by William. Also, Sep. 15, 100 a for 2 person (Id. 47)

## 2 William Ramshaw (Ramshew-Ramshaw-Rainshaw)

1620- according to the Muster of 1624/5, William Ramshaw came to Virginia in the Bona Venture, which sailed April, 1620, arriving in August of that year. At time of Census, February, 1624/5, he was among the colonists at Hog Island. At that time, Hog Island was a bone of contention between three overlapping claims- 500 acres claimed on behalf of Mary Bailey, s&c heir of John Bailey of 1618; Ralph Hamor established his colony there; and Southampton Hundred claimed part of the Island, under Captain John Utie, an officer of that Company.

Ramshaw's presence at Hog Island early in 1624/5 is interesting and not clearly understood, as in November, 1628, the Court ordered that "Willm Ramshaw shall goe down to Mathewes -Manor & worke at the trade of blacksmith untill he have by his worke satisfied twelve hundred pounds of Tobacco unto Mr Michaell Marshatt for which hee standeth indebted unto him, and alsoe to satisfye unto Mr. Utye 262 R of Tobacco & pay his fees to the Provost Marshall". (Minutes &c, 124).

There is nothing in the Muster to indicate either the age or status of Ramshaw, except we know he was neither a servant nor a tenant. In either event, he would have come at the expense of the Company for a seven year term; ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ if servant of an individual, would have been listed under the name of that individual.

William Ramshaw, Sly into the woods

0  
1  
7  
C. A. T.



8C.

At the same time, this action was taken just before the end of his seven years in Virginia- or rather, from date of a seven-year contract in England before sailing (in April 1620)- if he was under a contract other than servant or tenant. The one ~~xxxxxx~~ kind of seven year contract was that of apprentice- seven years being the usual length of such service. And in the event of apprentice,, his apprenticeship would have to be paid for, the apprentice receiving nothing for his services all during the time. Several things indicate that Thomas came to Va. in the care of John Utie, who came on the Bona Venture; and clearly, the group in which we find William's name in the Muster, belonged to the Southampton part of Hog Island under Utie.

Thomas Ramshaw was in Va. early in 1626, but there is nothing to show that he was there latter part of the year. Was that action taken late in 1626 to insure full payment of apprentice fees, court fee and transportation? Marshatt was a sea Captain. Many youths were sent to Va. as apprentices in whatever capacity they might find an opening. That he was sent as blacksmith to Mathews-Manor, indicates he was trained to that trade during his apprenticeship; then sent down to the neighborhood of Thomas Ramshaw, to work out those fees- unless paid in the meantime. Mathews Manor was Samuel Mathews' establishment at Denby where Thomas Ramshaw's early patents lay; and where Samuel later (1688) took up land. Mathews' had the most elaborate establishment in Virginia.

*Ramshaw*  
William subsequently visited England and returned with a wife, Katherine, and <sup>two</sup> several servants, for which or whom he received:

*servants &* 1635, July 1- pat. to him for 200 a. in Eliza. City in the neighborhood where we know Thomas had land very early. This pat. issued for his personal adv. and that of his wife Katherine. We have already seen where he pat. land that apparently he had acquired from Thomas. Also, on May 9, 1638, as William Rainshaw, he received pat. for 300 a. Lower Co. New Norf. on Eliza. R., for 6 persons (named). But before he recorded this, he appears to have turned right round and sold it, for it was patented May 24, 1638, by Henry Hawkins, as purchased from William Ramshaw. (1 Nugent, pp. 24; 82; 90.)

William appears to have sold out all of his Eliza. City holdings and treked northward. For a pat. to one Pinner in 1662, Mar. 18, in Eliza. City, which included "200 a granted Wm. Ramshaw 1 July, 1635 & after several sales, sold to Pinner". (Id. 511)

William and Katherine Ramshaw appear to have had three sons:

1. Samuel. See below. (He must have been born ca. 1636, or not later than 1638, as he must have been aged 21 in 1659 when empowered by Katherine to transact realty deals &c.)
2. Argall, witness to the power of atty.
3. Richard, who as Richard Renshaw, recd. pat. 300 a. in "Glester, Mar. 18, 1664/5, for 6 persons. (Id. 532) He apparently was given the 50a. pat. by Thomas in Warwick,, as a pat. to Richard Nixon 1665/6 Jan. 17, included that 50a. "granted to Richard Ranshaw 27 July, 1635 & assigned to Dixon". This is unquestionably the land patented to Thomas on that date, as shown by location as well as date. The record saying it was granted to Richard is merely one of the innumerable instances of carelessness by the recorders and copyists of those early days; for this was Dixon's first patent; and evidently the land was sold to him by Richard.

*Since*

NOTE

In Hotten, the group, consisting mostly of married couples, in which we find the name of William Ramshaw, may appear to be servants of John Chew, as only a short line separates the name of Walter Haslerwood from that of Henry Elwood, who is bracketed (in my copy) with that of Ramshaw, as coming in the Francis Bonaventure.

Few seem to have taken the trouble to read Hotten's explanation of those short, separating lines. They indicate omissions in the Hotten rendition of the Muster. (I have not a copy of Hotten at hand. I have stated the above simply from my familiarity with that work. I have before me, a transcript of the entire Muster, copied from one of the contemporary copies in Public Record Office, London.) In the original, each man's "Muster" of himself and family or household and his servants, if any, is followed by a list of all staple foods, live stock, arms, ammunition, houses and boats - in short, everything that in any way can be considered as munitions in case of siege or attack &c. In other words, the Muster is a combined census and muster. Indeed, even the hazards properly belong in such a muster; and most certainly, children are a har hazard in times of siege or attack by an enemy.

Following Chews three servants, is a detached list headed by Elwood and Ramshaw is list of his possessions which include a boat but no house. Then follows the list headed by Elwood and Ramshaw, of five married couples and Joane Davis. The only item listed with this group is "Corne.... 41 1/2 bushells". Then follows the Muster of "Sr George Yearlley's Men", consisting of two married couples, eleven single men, and two dead. Listed as his possessions here are merely two houses. The rest of Yearlley's Muster is given at James City.

It is hard to visualize the set-up here at Hog Island. Yearlley was interested in Southampton Hundred. Certainly, all from Utie to Yearlley inclusive, belonged to the Southampton settlement. But why all these people and only three houses to the lot - one at Utie's place; and two assigned to Yearlley.

The entire Hog Island Muster includes Ralph Hamor, servants-7 in all - with good supply of provisions, arms &c, 1 boat and "houses" - number not given. This followed by Lt. Edward Barkley's family, four servants, provisions (4 barrells of corne) - arms &c, one house. Then comes John Uty, wife, son, and three personal servants (I mean evidently owned by him) five barrells of corn, "1 swine", 1/2 1 house. Then, John Chew and wife, three servants, &c, as already given. It must be remembered that the Colony still had not recovered from the massacre; and we must conclude that all forces at the Island combined for mutual aid and comfort, and that Hamor shared his houses.

~~~~~  
No mention is made in the data sent, of the Sarah Ramshaw and the Samuel Ramshaw, in the Warwick Rent Rolls of 1704. What about them? I have my theory but only theory as I have no other records bearing directly upon those names, other than have been sent to me

Winnie G. Cook

Chicago, May 21, 1940

Dear Martha and Blanche:

At first, I thought I simply could not do anything with Ramshaw at just this time- and I should not have. Then decided to get it off my mind while partly fresh in my thoughts.

And right here, Martha, let me say, for no one but you, would I have tackled this for one cent under a hundred dollars; and I would have begrudged the time at that, for they really do not add anything to general historical knowledge- not to mine, but are a drain upon my time. I mention this so you may tell Mrs. Collier what she owes to you.

*Claims of this kind*

I am sending copies of my deductions to you two for your sharpest criticism. I am open to conviction, if this summary does not seem sound to you. As always, I carry the picture of conditions and their customs in mind, in dealing with any genealogical or historical problem- instead of merely accepting records at face value. It is this crime against historical verity- taking records at face value, that has led to so much subversion by writers. I made Tyler retract his calling Christopher Branch a servant of Osborne- just because Tyler never took the trouble to study that Muster. He made the correction in print, but did not explain why he made the original blunder.

Must get this in the mail and get to other things.

Love,  
Minnie G. Cook



Ramshaw

D

NOTE

In Hotten, the group, consisting mostly of married couples, in which we find the name of William Ramshaw, may appear to be servants of John Chew, as only a short line separates the name of Walter Haslerwood from that of Henry Elwood, who is bracketed (in my copy) with that of Ramshaw, as coming in the Francis Bonaventure.

Few seem to have taken the trouble to read Hotten's explanation of those short, separating lines. They indicate omissions in the Hotten rendition of the Muster. (I have not a copy of Hotten at hand. I have stated the above simply from my familiarity with that work. I have before me, a transcript of the entire Muster, copied from one of the contemporary copies in Public Record Office, London.) In the original, each man's "Muster" of himself and family or household and his servants, if any, is followed by a list of all staple foods, live stock, arms, ammunition, houses and boats - in short, everything that in any way can be considered as munitions in case of siege or attack &c. In other words, the Muster is a combined census and muster. Indeed, even the hazards properly belong in such a muster; and most certainly, children are a war hazard in times of siege or attack by an enemy.

Following Chews three servants, is a detached list headed by Elwood and Ramshaw is list of his possessions which include a boat but no house. Then follows the list headed by Elwood and Ramshaw, of five married couples and Joane Davis. The only item listed with this group is "Corne.... 41 1/2 bushells". Then follows the Muster of "Sr George Yearlley's Men", consisting of two married couples, eleven single men, and two dead. Listed as his possessions here are merely two houses. The rest of Yearlley's Muster is given at James City.

It is hard to visualize the set-up here at Hog Island. Yearlley was interested in Southampton Hundred. Certainly, all from Utie to Yearlley inclusive, belonged to the Southampton settlement. But why all these people and only three houses to the lot - one at Utie's place; and two assigned to Yearlley.

The entire Hog Island Muster includes Ralph Hamor's servants - 7 in all - with good supply of provisions, arms &c, 1 boat and "houses" - number not given. This followed by Lt. Edward Barkley's family, four servants, provisions (~~9~~ barrells of corne) - arms &c, one house. Then comes John Uty, wife, son, and three personal servants (I mean evidently owned by him) five barrels of corn, "1 swine", ~~1~~ 1 house. Then, John Chew and wife, three servants, &c, as already given. It must be remembered that the Colony still had not recovered from the massacre; and we must conclude that all forces at the Island combined for mutual aid and comfort, and that Hamor shared his houses.

-----  
No mention is made in the data sent, of the Sarah Ramshaw and the Samuel Ramshaw, in the Warwick Rent Rolls of 1704. What about them? I have my theory but only theory as I have no other records bearing directly upon those names, other than have been sent to me

Finnie G. Cook

At the same time, this action was taken just before the end of his seven years in Virginia- or rather, from date of a seven-year contract in England before sailing (in April 1620)- if he was under a contract other than servant or tenant. The one ~~xxxxxx~~ kind of seven year contract was that of apprentice- seven years being the usual length of such service. And in the event of apprentice,, his apprenticeship would have to be paid for, the apprentice receiving nothing for his services all during the time. Several things indicate that Thomas came to Va. in the care of John Utie, who came on the Bona Venture; and clearly, the group in which we find William's name in the Muster, belonged to the Southampton part of Hog Island under Utie.

Thomas Ramshaw was in Va. early in 1626, but there is nothing to show that he was there latter part of the year. Was that action taken late in 1626 to insure full payment of apprentice fees, court fee and transportation? Marshatt was a sea Captain. Many youths were sent to Va. as apprentices in whatever capacity they might find an opening. That he was sent as blacksmith to Mathews Manor, indicates he was trained to that trade during his apprenticeship; then sent down to the neighborhood of Thomas Ramshaw, to work out those fees- unless paid in the meantime. Mathews Manor was Samuel Mathews' establishment at Denby where Thomas Ramshaw's early patents lay; and where Samuel later (1688) took up land. Mathews' had the most elaborate establishment in Virginia.

*Ramshaw*  
William subsequently visited England and returned with a wife, Katherine, and ~~several~~ <sup>two</sup> servants, for which or whom he received:

*pat. 2*  
1635, July 1- pat. to him for 200 a. in Eliza. City in the neighborhood where we know Thomas had land very early, This pat. issued <sup>for</sup> for his personal adv. and that of his wife Katherine. We have already seen where he pat. land that apparently he had acquired from Thomas. Also, on May 9, 1638, as William Ramshaw, he received pat. for 300 a. Lower Co. New Norf. on Eliza. R., for 6 persons (named). But before he recorded this, he appears to have turned right round and sold it, for it was patented May 24, 1638, by Henry Hawkins, as purchased from William Ramshaw. (1 Nugent, pp. 24; 82; 90.)

William appears to have sold out all of his Eliza. City holdings and treked northward. For a pat. to one Pinner in 1662, Mar. 18, in Eliza. City, which included "200 a granted Wm. Ramshaw 1 July, 1635 & after several sales, sold to Pinner". (Id. 511)

William and Katherine Ramshaw appear to have had three sons:

1. Samuel. See below. (He must have been born ca. 1636, or not later than 1638, as he must have been aged 21 in 1659 when empowered by Katherine to transact realty deals &c.)
2. Argall, witness to the power of atty.
3. Richard, who as Richard Ramshaw, recd. pat. 300 a. in "Gloster, Mar. 18, 1664/5, for 6 persons. (Id. 532) He apparently was given the 50a. pat. by Thomas in Warwick,, as a pat. to Richard Dixon 1665/6 Jan. 17, included that 50a. "Granted to Richard Ramshaw 27 July, 1635 & assigned to Dixon". This is unquestionably the land patented to Thomas on that date, as shown by location as well as date. The record saying it was granted to Richard is merely one of the innumerable instances of carelessness by the recorders and copyists of those early days; for this was Dixon's first patent; and evidently the land was sold to him by Richard.



Thomas Ramshaw also had land in the Upper County of New Norfolk, according to patent to Thomas Holt, May 22, 1637- which patent is vaguely described as "N. side of E. branch of Eliz. R. upon the maine R. Fly into the woods, N. upon the head of the river, Fly & downe the river lying upon a Cr. joining upon land of Thomas Ramshaw Fly..." (21.57)

There is not one thing to show when or how Thomas came into possession of this land; therefore the inference is he must have acquired it and recorded it in record book then extant but not now, since apparently the survey was in his name, whether he still owned it or not. The question arises therefore, is this not the same land referred to in the patent to Thomas Peeres May 17, 1637, Peere's pat. described: "Up Co. New Norf. 3 ml. up in Eliz. R. adj. land of ~~William Ramshaw~~ to the woods Fly on the maine R. & Fly up the river." (Peeres pat. for 6 persons unnamed.) (1d. 55:57)

In other words- I take the Ramshaw land in Up. Norf. to have been pat. to Thomas and surveyed in his name, hence his name appearing in Holt's pat.; and Thomas having transferred it to William who was owner in 1637, hence William's name appearing in Peere's pat. The location seems to be identical in both.

The patent to William Ramshaw, Sep. 14, 1636, may be the explanation of when this land was transferred to William, at which time William, having "seated" the land, took out a patent in his own name: ~~150 a.~~ 150 a. in Eliz. City Co. being a neck of land "some 3 ml. up Eliz. river bounding Fly into the woods, Fly upon the maine river, Fly & Fly upon a Cr." This land for trans. 3 persons all named, hence an original patent since nothing to indicate it is otherwise, although it may be for land originally patented by Thomas- yet seated by William. Also, Sep. 15, 100 a for 2 persons (2d. 47)

## 2 William Ramshaw (Ramsheer-Ramshaw-Rainshaw)

1620- according to the Muster of 1624/5, William Ramshaw came to Virginia in the Bona Ventura, which sailed April, 1620, arriving in August of that year. At time of Census, February, 1624/5, he was among the colonists at Hog Island. At that time, Hog Island was a bone of contention between three overlapping claims- 500 acres claimed on behalf of Mary Bailey, s&c heir of John Bailey of 1618; Ralph Hamor established his colony there; and Southampton Hundred claimed part of the Island, under Captain John Mtie, an officer of that Company.

Ramshaw's presence at Hog Island early in 1624/5 is interesting and not clearly understood, as in November, 1624, the Court ordered that "Willm Ramshaw shall goe down to Mathewes Manor & worke at the trade of blacksmith untill he have by his worke satisfied twelve hundred pounds of Tobacco unto Mr Michaell Parshatt for which hee standeth indebted unto him, and alsoe to satisfye unto Mr. Mtye 262 lb of Tobacco & pay his fees to the Provost Marshall". (Minutes c. 124).

There is nothing in the Muster to indicate either the age or status of Ramshaw, except we know he was neither a servant nor a tenant. In either event, he would have come at the expense of the Company for a seven year term; ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ or, if servant of an individual, would have been listed under the name of that individual.

William Ramshaw, Fly into the woods

Ranshaw-Ransha- Ramshee- Ramshaw-Ramshawe-Renshaw-Rainshaw etc.

1. Thomas Ramshee-Ramshaw:

1623, Summer: The Sparrow, a little 30 ton trading vessel arrived at Virginia. ( 2 Rec.Va. Comp. p.496)

Edward Maunders, purser, was accused of appropriating goods belonging to the owner, Thomas Weston. The case came up in Court Jan.9, 1623/4; and again February 20, 1625/6. On the latter date Thomas Ramshee testified that Mr. Weston was owner of the Sparrow "and sett her owt at his Charge from London"- that "maunder came as purser of her, and this deponent knoweth of no goods that maunders had" of his own in the shipp, he being a very poor man and had to borrow money from Weston for the necessities of the trip over. This testimony plainly shows it is first hand information; and that Thomas Ranshaw (Ramshee being obviously a phonetic or clerical misspelling.) (Minutes of the Council and General Court, pp.10;96) *was in Va. at least as early as 1623*

Thomas Ramshaw is not in the Muster of 1624/5; but this testimony, given February, 1625/6 by Ramshaw, shows he was in Virginia before that Muster. This Thomas Weston was the one who engineered the so-called "flight" of the Brewster-Bradford Scrooby group to Holland 1608; and later the voyage of the Mayflower to New England- a trader and professional promoter. It is probable, judging from the little record evidence available, that Ramshaw was associated with him to some degree; and that Ramshaw was in Virginia even much earlier than 1623. This is indicated by his earliest land holdings in Virginia.

1635, July 27- Pat. issued to Thomas Ranshaw for 50 a. upon Warwick r. and Deepe Cr.; trans. 1 servant- unnamed. Asterix shows omission is in the record and not merely by compiler because of imperfect ms.

Same date, to same- pat. for 250 a. Eliz.City 06 upon land of Chris.Stokes, on new Poquoson. Trans. 5 persons as above. (These two tracts evidently on the divide between the York and James rivers. ) (1 Nugent 29) *Warwick*

For reasons too complex to give time to at this writing, patents of this type began to appear 1635. They are renewals, not original patents, in compliance of an order by the King in 1634. So far as I have investigated, they are the earliest patents of early arrivals- for instance, Capt. Thomas Harris, 1611, recd.pat for 700 a. Henrico, 400 a. willed him by Ann Gurganey Feb.1619/20; so we know he had that land as early as that date; and the other 300 a. for 8 persons unnamed. This in July 1637 (Ib. 60); yet on Nov, 17, 1635, he recd.pat. for 750 a. adj Edward Virgany (that is unquestionably Gurgany or Gurganey- in other words, adj. the original Gurganey land willed to Thomas in 1619/20 by Gurganey's widow); This land for 13 persons named. The pat. of 1637, being *was* renewal of Harris' first pat. of which there was no extant record, ~~ppp/ll/~~ (1 Nugent 33) (There is quite a story connected with this phase- too long for this analysis.)

Thomas Ransha, recd.pat. Aug.23, 1642, 300 a. also upon Deepe Cr. near to Stokes Cr. dividing this from Chris.Boyce in Warwick Co. 150 a. by purchase, 150 for 3 prans.named. (Id. 133)

William Ranshaw

1. The Muster of Lt. Barkley:

William Ranshaw in the Francis Bonaventure,  
Hotten, page 237.

(In another place the date of above ship is given as 1620)

William Ranshaw, 200 acres, Elizabeth City County, July 1, 1635.  
North upon the mouth of Elizabeth River, south into the main  
woods, bounded west by a Creek and east upon another Creek. 50 A.  
for his personal venture and 50 A. for personal adventure of his  
wife Katherine and 100 acres for trans, 2 persons, John Stephens  
and Thomas Pawford.  
Cav. & Pio., p. 24.

Thomas Meeres patented land in New Norfolk, May 17, 1637, 3 miles  
up Elizabeth River, adjoining the land of William Ranshaw.  
Cav. & Pio. p. 55

2. Thomas Ranshaw. (He is never named as headright and although  
he was rather young to be patenting if he was born after 1620, we  
must remember that the age of maturity came much earlier in these  
formative years.)

Thomas Ranshaw. 50 A. Denby Co. July 27, 1635. Upon Warwick  
River, north west upon the Deepe Cr. into the forest and south  
upon one Burrows. Trans of 1 servant.  
Cav. & Pio. p. 29.

Same 250 A. Elizabeth County. July 27, 1635. East upon the land  
of Christopher Stoakes and S. upon the Poquoson. Trans. 5 persons  
Cav. & Pio., p. 29.

Thomas Holt patented land in Upper Co. of New Norfolk, n. side of  
East Branch of Elizabeth River, upon the maine River, S. into the  
woods, N. upon the head of the River, Ely. and down the Ck. lying  
upon the land of Thomas Ranshaw. May 22, 1637. (This is obviously  
the land patented by William Ranshaw.)  
Cav. & Pioneers, p. 57.

Blanche Adams Chapman

Original in Mallicote folder



Christopher Stokes patented land in Charles River, in 1637, adjoining his own land and the land of Thomas Ranshaw. Cav. & Pio., p. 75.

Thomas Ransha, 300 A. Warwick County. Aug. 25, 1642. Being a neck of land called Harwoods Neck, butting upon the Deepe Ok, near land of William Cox to Stokes Ok., dividing this from the land of Christopher Boyce, 150 A. due by purchase of patent from John Garrett and the other for transportation of 3 persons, Richard Puse, George Sutton, Michael Slowly. Cav. & Pio., p. 132.

Samuel Chappell patented land adjoining the land of Thomas Ranshaw in Warwick County, July 4, 1664. Cav. & Pio. p. 443.

3. Samuel Ranshaw. Katherine Staynes, widow of Thomas Staynes, Power of Attorney to son Samuel Ranshaw. 1659. Old Rep., Bk., 1656-64, p. 100

(Saml. Mackintosh) p. 84

Ejectment. John Doe, Plt. vs. Peter Hoggard and Richard Floyd, about land in the Parish of Warwick, which Sarah Mackintosh, widow and William Smith and Mary his wife demised to the Plt. for a term: ----- we find one Thomas Davis was seized of the said tenements etc., made last will and testament in writing, Feb. 26, 167-, who had a daughter Frances, who took to husband in year 1674 and had issue a daughter born in 1678, who deeded the land to Peter Hoggard in 1676 to Peter Hoggard by will 1678 to his brother Samuel Hoggard, deft. Peter Hoggard being the son of sd. Samuel. John Conyers died in 1678 and the sd. Fra-- in 1677 and that the said Frances had no issue living at the time of her death, ~~between 50 and 60 years ago and that the reversion went~~ to Samuel Ranshaw in will of Thomas Davis and said Samuel Ranshaw had issue at the time of death five daughters, Elizabeth, Annie, Sarah, Martha and Mary. Sarah and Mary are the lessors of the Plt.-- that Elizabeth and Martha are now dead, but leave issue living, and that the wife of the deft Hoggard now living is daughter of the sd. Martha. The aforesaid Samuel Ranshaw was cousin to the sd. Thomas Davis, sd. Ranshaw has issue Sarah, now Sarah Mackintosh and Mary, now Mary Smith. Enos Mackintosh has been dead 9 years, died in 1720 and the said Sarah Mackintosh is 47 years old and was married about 27 years ago. 1721 Warwick Papers, p. 88. Original in William and Mary Library, photostats in Archives, Richmond, Va.

John Conyers

(over)

Blanche Adams Shagman

3

Samuel Ranshaw in 1688 patented 132 acres on the Oaken Swamp Parish of Denbeigh, adjoining Capt. Mathews and John Lewis. Land Book 7, p. 678

4. Sarah Ranshaw Born 1682, married 1702, Enos Mackintosh.

At the request of Sarah McIntosh, widow, ordered Miles Cary, Ralph Gough, John Wheeler (?) and Samuel Bland settle estate of Enos Mackintosh. 1729.  
Warwick Papers, p. 91

Feb. 5, 1756, Sarah, widow of Enos Mackintosh, sues Samuel Young and Martha his wife for her thirds of the said Enos' estate. Warwick Order Book, 1749-62, p. 381.

~~Martha was the wife of Robert Mackintosh, who was from this estate the executor of his father, Enos Mackintosh's estate.~~

Aug. 5, 1756. Ind. bet. Thurman Hoggard of Princess Anne Co. Ship carpenter and Susanna his wife deed to Richard Mackintosh being bereaved of partition to certain lands in this County, between Thurman Hoggard and Samuel Young and Martha his wife and Richard Mackintosh.  
Warwick Order Book 1749-62, p. 432

Thus we see that Enos and Sarah Mackintosh had the following children : Samuel, Robert, Richard.

5. Robert Mackintosh, married Martha ~~McIntosh~~ <sup>McIntosh</sup> ?

March 7, 1750/1. A marriage contract between Samuel Young and ~~Mackintosh~~ Martha McIntosh and the children of the said Martha and Robert Mackintosh and a schedule thereon endorsed, was acknowledged by the Samuel Young and Robert Mackintosh, two of the parties thereto and proved as to Martha by the oaths of Daniel Dunn and John ----, two of the witnesses thereto.  
Warwick Order Bk., 1749-62, p. 125.

William Langston is appointed guardian to Robert McIntosh, orphan of Robert McIntosh decd., His security, John Drewry and Samuel Puryear. Feb. 1, 1759, p. 579.

Ibid.

Blanche Adams Chapman



Nov. 8, 1758. Thomas Mallicote and wife Sarah vs. Samuel Puryear in chancery. Warwick Order Bk, 1749-62, p. 562.

June 7, 1759. Samuel Puryear to pay Thomas and Sarah Mallicote, 13k-5-10 and costs in the chancery suit. p. 591

March 4, 1762, Mary McIntosh, orphan of Robert McIntosh, chose Thomas Mallicote her guardian, Moory Mallicote his security. p. 679.

Richard McIntosh was appointed guardian of Margaret, orphan of Robert McIntosh. p. 679.

~~Mary McIntosh's Book shows that Thomas Mallicote died in 1814.~~

6. Sarah Mackintosh. Above suits and items prove that she married Thomas Mallicote. The Warwick Tax lists prove that Thomas Mallicote died in 1814. *a fact as shown below.*

~~He died in 1814. This also was the "Sarah Mackintosh Mallicote" who married John Mackintosh in 1814.~~  
Warwick Tax List.

1788 - 1814. Thomas Mallicote 314 A.

1815. John Mallicote of Surry, 140 A., from Thomas Mallicote by will.

The orphans of George Mallicote, 140 A., from Thomas Mallicote by will.

Robert M. Mallicote, 60 A. from Thomas Mallicote by will.

7. John Mallicote. John Mallicote married Mary Davis Gray, the daughter of James Gray of Surry,

John Mallicote married Mary Gray. Dec. 20, 1787.

Marriage Register, p. 22

Consent of James Gray.

Will of John Mallicote: to wife personality, provided she does not claim dower in my Warwick County lands, various children named and my other married children.

Nov. 17, 1824. R. Feb. 28, 1825.

Surry Bk. 1822-27, p. 315.

Page 531, Mary D. Mallicote received her share of her husband's estate.

Surry Bk. 1832-34, p. 620-23. Settlement of estate of John Mallicote and Mary D. Mallicote. Legatees: Robert Rowell

for his wife; 2. Robert M. Mallicote 3. James Mallicote

4. William Mallicote. 5. Edmund Lewelling for his wife.

6. John Mallicote. 7. Sasan Mallicote, 8 John P. Mitchell

son of Mary Mallicote Mitchell. 9 Sally M. Lewelling.

Blanche Adams Chapman

Sarah Mallicote made of place was; I have seen Sarah Mackintosh  
dau. of Robert



5-  
⑩ Heirs of Thomas Mallicote. March 1834.  
John Mallicote admtr. of Mary D. Mallicote.

Will of James Gray: to daughter Mary Davis Gray.  
~~James~~ Feb. 9, 1788 R. June 25, 1788  
Valentine Papers, p. 555

8. Sally McIntosh Mallicote. She married James Lewelling, died 1828. Sally M. Mallicote born ca. 1790, died bet. 1840-50. (This was likely a second marriage for both parties, for James was born by 1765 and had a son Edmund, b. 1798, who married a sister of Sally's. Sally M. Mallicote Bewelling married in 1811, John Lewelling, who was probably a brother of her second husband James Lewelling. Compare this last with 4th of Mrs. Heden's data just sent & which I do not understand

9. Thomas Lewelling, born ca. 1825, died May 16, 1855 aged 29 years. Married ca. 1846 Frances Wood. B. 1822, d. June 10, 1885. had:

10. Sarah Elizabeth Lewelling, born May 5, 1847, d. 9-21-1908 married 1865, John Braxton Lake, b. 11-26-141, d. 2-1-1915

11. Louise Lake, born in Hampton, married Francis Collier.

Blanche Adams Chapman.

77M(2) v. 13 p. 267